

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/598,577	Applicant(s) HOBSON ET AL.	
	Examiner CHANTEL GRAHAM	Art Unit 1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHANTEL GRAHAM. (3) Samuel B. Laferty.

(2) Michael Marcheschi. (4) William Elliot/David Hobson.

Date of Interview: 22 June 2010.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: all applied.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the pending rejections and ways to overcome the rejections and/or applicant pointed out possible differences between the claimed invention and the references, as applied.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/CHANTEL GRAHAM/ Examiner, Art Unit 1797	/Michael A Marcheschi/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797
---	--